



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/502,297	07/22/2004	Sven-Ingvar Lundahl	10400C-000112/US	1854
30593	7590	08/28/2006	EXAMINER	
HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.			LANGDON, EVAN H	
P.O. BOX 8910			ART UNIT	
RESTON, VA 20195			PAPER NUMBER	
			3654	

DATE MAILED: 08/28/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/502,297	Applicant(s) LUNDAHL, SVEN-INGVAR	
	Examiner Evan H. Langdon	Art Unit 3654	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 June 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 and 14-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 and 14-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.


Claims 1-6 and 8-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Balke (US 1,437,954) in view of Orange (US 5,513,819) and Zuk et al (US 5,791,590).

Balke discloses a bobbin, which has a cylinder 1 formed integrally with two circumferential end flanges 2 forming U-shaped channel; and

wherein the cylinder includes a plurality of cylinder elements each having a slightly curved, radially inner surface forming a circumference of the cylinder (see below)

each end flange 2 consists of a plurality of spaced apart radial flange elements 2 distributed along the circumference of the cylinder 1.

Art Unit: 3654



Orange teaches a bobbin of plastic, which has a cylinder formed integrally with circumferential end flanges 14, 16 forming U-shaped channel and each end flange a made of one pieced of plastic (col. 2 line 39-43).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the material of the bobbin of Balke to be made of plastic as suggested by Orange, to make the bobbin available for reuse since plastic is more durable (col. 2 line 39).

Orange discloses the claimed invention except for the plastic bobbin formed by injection molding. Zuk teaches that it is known to form a one-piece reel element made of plastic by means of injection molding because injection molding is a widely used manufacturing process appropriate for making plastic articles (col. 1, lines 34-67).

In regards to claim 2, Balke as modified by Orange and Zuk teaches the flange elements 2 (Balke) over the entire radial extent have a constant extension in the circumferential direction, the flange elements of each end flange having a total extension in the circumferential direction that is essentially equal to the circumference of the cylinder.

In regards to claims 3-5 and 15-18, Balke as modified by Orange and Zuk teaches a plurality of axial grooves (Fig. 2 Balke) are formed in the outer and inner circumferential surface of the cylinder, where the outer and inner circumferential grooves are located opposite of each other, each groove extending the entire length of the cylinder between a point between two adjoining flange elements of one end flange and a point between two adjoining flange elements of the other end flange.

In regards to claims 6 and 19, Balke as modified by Orange and Zuk teaches each flange element at its radially inner end has a lug 26 (Orange) which extends past the inner circumferential surface of the cylinder and has a circumferential extent that decreases radially inwards.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide Balke with the lug of Orange, to connect the channels to each other because it would be easier to assemble..

It would have been obvious to perform the method steps of claims 8-12 when manufacturing the reel bobbin of Balke as modified by Orange in its usual and expected fashion.

In regards to claim 9, Balke as modified by Orange and Zuk teaches the channel ends 36, 40 are connected to each other by protrusions 38, 42 (Fig. 1A and 3, Orange).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 7 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Balke as modified by Orange and Zuk, and in further view of Koskelainen (US 6,021,974).

Koskelainen teaches a reel bobbin having an articulate projection 8 connecting flanges 7 and 10.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the flanges of Balke as modified by Orange to include articulate projections as suggested by Koskelainen, to provide stability to the plastic bobbin.

Response to Arguments

In response to the Applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the Examiner recognizes that the references cannot be arbitrarily combined and that there must be some reason why one skilled in the art would be motivated to make the proposed combination of primary and secondary references. *In re Nomiya*, 184 USPQ 607 (CCPA 1975).

However, there is no requirement that a motivation to make the modification be expressly articulated. The test for combining references is what the combination of the disclosure taken as a whole would suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art. *In re McLaughlin*, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971). References are evaluated by what they suggest to one versed in the art, rather than by their specific disclosures. *In re Bozek*, 163 USPQ 545 (CCPA 1969). In this case, the Zuk reference is relied upon to teach that it is known to form a one-piece reel element made of plastic by means of injection molding because injection molding is a widely used manufacturing process appropriate for making plastic articles (col. 1, lines 34-67). The applicant's suggestion that the Zuk reference teaches away from using injection molding is contradictory to his own argument that the reference is to be taken as a whole. The Zuk reference discloses the pluses and minuses to using injection molding in the manufacturing process in the references "Background of the Invention" and establishes the use of injection molding in the art. One having ordinary skill in the art would inherently be aware of the processes benefits and deficiencies.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

Art Unit: 3654

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Evan H. Langdon whose telephone number is (571)272-6948. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kathy Matecki can be reached on (571) 272-6951. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



ehl



KATHY MATECKI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600